



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

AF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,214	03/04/2004	Sheng-Ping Zhong	12013/62704	4161
23838	7590	01/29/2007	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PREBILIC, PAUL B	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		3738
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/29/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/792,214	ZHONG, SHENG-PING
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 22-26, 34, and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-25 and 40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 26,34 and 36-39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_                    5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 \_\_\_\_\_                    6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 22-25 and 40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the communication filed February 6, 2006.

***Terminal Disclaimer***

The terminal disclaimer filed November 3, 2006 does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c) because:

An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 26, 34, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 26 sets forth both a "coating composition formed an aqueous emulsion or dispersion comprising a polycarbonate-polyurethane composition"; yet dependent claim 34 sets forth "said composition is bonded to said surface." For this reason, it is unclear whether the coating is in the former or latter state or condition. Claim 34 seems to suggest that the coating bonded to the surface and it not in a dispersed state, but that claim 26 is in a dispersed state.

Furthermore, if the coating composition is bonded to the surface of a medical device, it is more than a coating composition as the preamble suggests. It becomes a coating combined with a medical device. Claims 34-39 are also considered indefinite because they depend upon claim 26.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 26, 34, and 36-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,197,051. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope but are read on by the patented claims. For this reason, the present claims are considered to be clearly obvious over the patented claims.

Claims 26, 34, and 36-39 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,723,121. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope but are read on by the patented claims. For this reason, the present claims are considered to be clearly obvious over the patented claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 26, 34, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shults et al (US 4,994,167) where BAYBOND 123 (see column 13, lines 11-46 of Shults) is equivalent to Applicant's Bayhydrol 123 (see page 8, lines 1-3 of the specification) and wherein the organic acid functional groups are the carboxylate groups on the polymer backbone; see column 13, lines 11-27. It appears that the claims do not preclude the n-methyl-2-pyrrolidone contained in each of these dispersions; see columns 13 and 14 of Shults. The coating composition contains an excess of polyfunctional crosslinking agent as claimed because the excess is not compared to any other reactant or to any known value so it reads on any unreacted crosslinking agent in the unreacted aqueous dispersion. Alternatively, since BAYBOND 123 or Bayhydrol 123 are acceptable materials for the invention as disclosed, they inherently contain an

excess of polyfunctional crosslinking agent to the extent required by the present claims. For these reasons, the claims are anticipated by Shults.

With regard to claims 38 and 39, the surface as claimed is one of the inner layers of the membrane (34) that can be made of many of the same polymers as claimed; see column 12, line 39 et seq. The surface is not positively required by the claim.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the traversal of the Shults anticipation rejection that Shults has no excess of crosslinking agent, the Examiner asserts that the claim language is fully met because the excess is not compared to any other reactant or to any known value. Therefore, it reads on any unreacted crosslinking agent in the unreacted aqueous dispersion. Alternatively, since BAYBOND 123 or Bayhydrol 123 are acceptable materials for the invention as disclosed, they inherently contain an excess of polyfunctional crosslinking agent to the extent required by the present claims. For these reasons, the claims are anticipated by Shults.

Applicant argues that Shults does not meet the claim language because it is said to not contain any bioactive agent. However, the present claims do not positively require a bioactive agent. For this reason, the argument is not commensurate with the scope of the present claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action if the application is not stored in image format (i.e. the IFW system) or published.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Paul B. Prebilic whose telephone number is (571) 272-4758. He can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 3738

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Paul Prebilic  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3738